Vote No. 124

May 22, 1996, 10:39 a.m. Page S-5467 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/Hungry-Homeless Children

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1997-2002. S. Con. Res. 57. Wellstone amendment No. 3987.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 100-0

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 57, the Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1997-2002, will balance the Federal budget in fiscal year (FY) 2002 by slowing the overall rate of growth in spending over the next 6 years to below the rate of growth in revenue collections. The rate of growth in entitlements such as Medicare, Medicaid, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, and the Earned Income Credit will be slowed. No changes will be made to the Social Security program, the spending for which will grow from \$348 billion in FY 1996 to \$467 billion in FY 2002. Defense spending will be essentially frozen at its present level.

The Wellstone amendment would add the following statements: "It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions in this budget resolution assume that Congress will not enact or adopt any legislation that would increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless" and "It is the sense of Congress that the assumptions in this budget resolution assume that in the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry or homeless children by the end of fiscal year 1997, the Congress would revisit the provisions of said legislation which caused such increase and would, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase."

Those favoring the amendment contended:

We offered this amendment several times last year. The first couple of times it was defeated because of the measures to which it was offered. Then it was accepted by voice vote. We do not think a voice vote is enough. Senators should be on record as being committed to not passing legislation that will increase the number of hungry or homeless children, and as being determined to pass correcting legislation to any bills that in practice prove to be harmful to children. We urge our colleagues to accept this amendment.

(See other side) **YEAS (100)** NAYS (0) NOT VOTING (0) Republicans Republicans Republican **Democrats** Democrats Democrats (53 or 100%) (47 or 100%) (0 or 0%) (0 or 0%)(0)(0)Abraham Helms Akaka Inouye Ashcroft Hutchison Baucus Johnston Inhofe Kennedy Bennett Biden Jeffords Bond Bingaman Kerrey Brown Kassebaum Boxer Kerry Burns Kempthorne Bradley Kohl Campbell Kyl Breaux Lautenberg Chafee Lott Bryan Leahy Bumpers Levin Coats Lugar Cochran Lieberman Mack Bvrd Cohen McCain Conrad Mikulski Coverdell McConnell Moseley-Braun Daschle Murkowski Moynihan Craig Dodd D'Amato Nickles Dorgan Murray DeWine Pressler Exon Nıınn Feingold Dole Roth Pell EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: Domenici Santorum Feinstein Pryor Faircloth Shelby Ford Reid 1—Official Buisiness Frist Simpson Glenn Robb 2—Necessarily Absent Gorton Graham Rockefeller Smith 3—Illness Gramm Snowe Harkin Sarbanes 4—Other Grams Specter Heflin Simon Grassley Hollings Wellstone Stevens SYMBOLS: Gregg Thomas Wyden AY—Announced Yea Hatch Thompson AN-Announced Nav Hatfield Thurmond PY—Paired Yea Warner PN-Paired Nay

VOTE NO. 124 MAY 22, 1996

While favoring the amendment, some Senators expressed the following reservations:

We are of course against increasing hunger and homelessness among children. We further note that we do not think that anything in this resolution will increase the number of hungry or homeless children. Many of our liberal colleagues disagree. Our differences are over the means, not the goals. Democrats tend to believe that the more money we spend on welfare, the less hunger and homelessness there will be. Republicans tend to believe that the social programs we have now are largely responsible for the amount of poverty and homelessness in America because they destroy the nuclear family and breed serial dependency. We will probably never agree on the causes of poverty or the effects of various approaches to reducing it, but we can all certainly agree that we do not favor it.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.